

REMARKS

The present application includes pending claims 1-25. In particular, claims 1-4 and 7-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,643,781 ("Merriam") in view of U.S. 7,133,920 ("Tsujisawa") and U.S. 7,317,798 ("Saito"). Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merriam in view of Tsujisawa, Saito and U.S. 5,748,084 ("Ishikoff"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons previously discussed during prosecution and the following:

As an initial matter, the Applicants note that a goal of patent examination is to provide a prompt and complete examination of a patent application.

It is essential that patent applicants obtain a prompt yet complete examination of their applications. Under the principles of compact prosecution, each claim should be reviewed for compliance with every statutory requirement for patentability in the *initial review* of the application, even if one or more claims are found to be deficient with respect to some statutory requirement. Thus, Office personnel *should* state *all* reasons and bases for rejecting claims in the *first* Office action. Deficiencies should be explained clearly, particularly when they serve as a basis for a rejection. Whenever practicable, Office personnel should indicate how rejections may be overcome and how problems may be resolved. A failure to follow this approach can lead to unnecessary delays in the prosecution of the application.

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2106(II). As such, the Applicants assume, based on the goals of patent examination noted above, that this Office Action has set forth "all reasons and bases" for rejecting the claims.

Further, this Response does not amend any of the claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that this Response cannot raise any new issues with respect to the pending claims that would require a further search.

The Applicants now turn to the rejections, in particular. Claim 1, for example, recites, in part, "wherein said at least one registration information

comprises a device serial ID number associated with said location where the communication device is registered.” The claim clearly recites that the device serial number is associated **with a location where the communication device is registered**.

As noted above, Merriam, Tsujisawa and Saito form the basis for all claim rejections. The Office Action acknowledges that the “combined teachings of Merriam and Tsujisawa fail to disclose of registration information associated with a device serial ID number associated where the location [of] the communication device is registered.” See December 3, 2008 Office Action at page 3.

In order to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action cites Saito. See *id.* In particular, the Office Action cites Saito at column 14, lines 49-67.

Saito discloses that the “device ID of the mobile terminal corresponding to the acquired home address is registered in the database 114.” See Saito at column 14, lines 52-54. While Saito discloses that the device ID is registered in the database, there is nothing in the portion of Saito relied on by the Examiner, nor the remainder of Saito, that describes, teaches or suggests that the device ID is associated with a location where the mobile terminal itself is registered. Again, Saito merely discloses that the device ID is registered in a database. None of Saito, Merriam or Tsujisawa describes, teaches or suggests, however, “wherein said at least one registration information comprises a device serial ID number associated with said location where the communication device is registered,” as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 7, 9 and 15 recite similar limitations. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Merriam, Tsujisawa and Saito do not render claims 1-4 and 7-25 unpatentable.

Additionally, claim 22 recites “wherein said registering comprises entering the device serial ID number of the communication device associated with said location where the communication device is registered if the device is to be used only at said location where the communication device is registered, and wherein said registering comprises entering the device serial ID number of the

communication device, a user name and a password if the communication device is to be used at another location that is separate and distinct from said location wherein the communication device is registered.” Claims 23-25 recite similar limitations. The Office Action relies on Saito at column 14, lines 49-67 as disclosing the limitations regarding the device ID. See December 3, 2008 Office Action at page 10. However, Saito merely discloses that a device ID is registered in a database. There is nothing in the cited references, however, that describes, teaches or suggests “**entering the device serial ID number of the communication device associated with said location **where the communication device is registered** if the device is to be used **only at said location where the communication device is registered**, and wherein said registering comprises **entering the device serial ID number of the communication device, a user name and a password** if the communication device is to be used at another location that is separate and distinct from said location wherein the communication device is registered.” Indeed, there is nothing in the portion of Saito relied on by the Office Action (nor the remainder of Saito) that describes, teaches or suggests entering a device serial ID number of a communication device in order to use the communication device. Thus, for at least these additional reasons, the proposed combination of references does not render claims 22-25 unpatentable.**

The Applicants also respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Merriam, Tsujisawa, Saito and Ishikoff does not render claims 5 and 6 unpatentable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. The Applicants expressly reserve the right, however, to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a future claim rejection).

The Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees, or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 5, 2009

/Joseph M. Butscher/
Joseph M. Butscher
Registration No. 48,326

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100